

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 3-4, 6, 19-20 and 22 without prejudice. New Claims 25-26 are added herein. Claims 1-2, 7-12, 14-18 and 23-26 are pending. Claims 1-2, 7, 9, 11, 17 and 23 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Specification

The specification is amended herein to capitalize the term "Bluetooth."

103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14 and 17-18

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0011467) in view of Yoshizawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036273). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14 and 17-18 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Suomela nor Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, show or suggest that a "trusted device" (as defined by the claims) is distinguished from non-trusted devices in a list of devices within wireless range, nor do Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, show or suggest that a user can make a choice as to whether or not a device should be designated as a trusted device.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest “designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list such that said device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 1; “receiving a user input indicating that said device is being designated a trusted device, wherein as a trusted device said passkey is to be automatically used for subsequent connections with said device” as recited in independent Claim 9; or “receiving a user input indicating that said other device is being designated a trusted device ... and indicating that said other device is a trusted device in said list such that said other device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 17.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the claimed features of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants also respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 2 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 10-12 and 14 dependent on Claim 9, and Claim 18 dependent on Claim 17, and that Claims 2, 10-12, 14 and 18 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 7, 15 and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and further in view of Baptist et al. ("Baptist;" U.S. Patent No. 5,465,392). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 7, 15 and 23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination.

Claims 7, 15 and 23 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela and Yoshizawa. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist, alone or in combination with Suomela and Yoshizawa, does not show or suggest "designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list such that said device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices" as recited in independent Claim 1; "receiving a user input indicating that said device is being designated a trusted device, wherein as a trusted device said passkey is to be automatically used for subsequent connections with said device" as recited in independent Claim 9; or "receiving a user input indicating that said other device is being designated a trusted device ... and indicating that said other device is a trusted device in said list such that said other device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices" as recited in independent Claim 17.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are not shown or suggested by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants further submit that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are also not shown by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination, because Claims 7, 15 and 23 recite additional limitations. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 7, 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 8, 16 and 24

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and further in view of Sormunen et al. ("Sormunen;" U.S. Patent No. 6,112,078). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 8, 16 and 24 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination.

Claims 8, 16 and 24 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela and Yoshizawa. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen, alone or in combination with Suomela and Yoshizawa, does not show or suggest "designating said device as a trusted device ...;

and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list such that said device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 1; “receiving a user input indicating that said device is being designated a trusted device, wherein as a trusted device said passkey is to be automatically used for subsequent connections with said device” as recited in independent Claim 9; or “receiving a user input indicating that said other device is being designated a trusted device ... and indicating that said other device is a trusted device in said list such that said other device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 17.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are not shown or suggested by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants further submit that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are also not shown by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination, because Claims 8, 16 and 24 recite additional limitations. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8, 16 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-2, 7-12, 14-18 and 23-24, as well as new Claims 25-26, overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

William A. Zarbis

Date: 6/27/05

William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060